## REMARKS

Claims 1 – 16 and 19 - 31 are pending in the application. Claims 17 and 18 were previously canceled.

On December 5, 2008, Applicants conducted a teleconference with Examiner Jarrett. Applicants thank Examiner Jarrett for making time for the teleconference.

On May 28, 2008, the Office mailed an office action (hereinafter "the office action of May 28, 2008"). In the office action of May 28, 2008, claims 1 - 16 and 19 – 31[1] were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent No. 6,177,860 to Cromer et al. (hereinafter "the Cromer et al. patent"). On August 28, 2008, Applicants submitted an amendment of the claims (hereinafter "the amendment of August 28, 2008") with a request for continued examination (RCE).

The Office Action of October 17, 2008 is maintaining the section 102(b) rejection of claims 1 – 16 and 19 – 31. However, even though the Office Action of October 17, 2008 is a first action after the RCE, the Office is designating it as a final action. Below, **Applicants are requesting reconsideration and a withdrawal of the finality of the Office Action of October 17, 2008**.

In the amendment of August 28, 2008, Applicants amended claim 1 as follows:

A method ~~for adaptation of an intelligent unit to a location in a system,~~ comprising ~~the following steps~~:

situating ~~associating~~ a configuration device ~~with the~~ at an installation location in a system,

wherein the configuration device is connected to a ~~coupling location~~ coupler for ~~the~~ an intelligent unit ~~in the system~~; and

storing data in the configuration device, pertaining to the installation location,

wherein the data is transmitted from the configuration device to a logic device that processes the data for configuration of the intelligent unit ~~in the system~~.

[1] The Office Action of May 28, 2008 states that claims 1 – 16 and 19 – 27 are rejected. However, from the detailed description of the rejection, it is apparent that claims 1 – 16 and 19 – 31 are being rejected.

FIG. 1 is a block diagram of a system that employs the method of claim 1. The system includes a configuration device, i.e., a marker 22, situated at a location 2 in the system.

The Cromer et al. patent is directed to an RFID device in a computer, wherein the RFID device is accessed through an access flap in a carton in which the computer is packaged (col. 2, lines 9 – 18). In this regard, the Cromer et al. patent, with reference to FIG. 4, describes an RFID chip module 411, mounted on a circuit card 413, in an electronic device 410, packed in a carton 417 (col. 2, lines 57 – 64). Additionally, the Cromer et al. patent, with reference to FIG. 1, at col. 3, lines 14 – 16, states:

> At block 21 the computer manufacturer assembles the computer and installs a dual port RFID tag as a small part of the computers [sic] memory space.

Applicants respectfully submit that whereas the Cromer et al. patent:

(A) describes the RFID device as being accessed through an access flap in a carton in which the computer is packaged,

(B) describes RFID chip module 411 as being in electronic device 410, packed in carton 417, and

(C) explains that the computer manufacturer assembles the computer and installs a dual port RFID tag,

the Cromer et al. patent neither discloses nor suggests **situating a configuration device at an installation location** in a system, as was recited in claim 1 pursuant to the amendment of August 28, 2008.

The Office Action of October 17, 2008, on page 3, notes that the Cromer et al. patent explains that the RFID tag can include a MAC address, and the Office Action of October 17, 2008 suggests that the MAC address is indicative of data "pertaining to an installation location." Applicants respectfully disagree.

The Cromer et al. patent, with reference to FIG. 1, at col. 3, lines 15 – 19, states:

> At block 23, an initialization program reads the unique IEEE assigned media access control (MAC) address which the manufacturer has placed in the

> computer communication hardware and stores it in the RFID tag memory using the serial interface port.

Based on the statement at col. 3, lines 15 – 19, it appears that the MAC address identifies the computer communications hardware. The MAC address does not describe the installation location. Applicants submit that the Cromer et al. patent does not disclose data **pertaining to the installation location**, as was recited in claim 1 pursuant to the amendment of August 28, 2008.

In view of the reasoning provided above, Applicants submit that the amendment of August 28, 2008 introduced into claim 1, recitals of features that are not disclosed by the Cromer et al. patent. As such, in the Office Action of October 17, 2008, claim 1 should not have been rejected on the same grounds and art of record as in the office action of May 28, 2008. Accordingly, Applicants are requesting that the Office **please withdraw the finality of the Office Action of October 17, 2008**.

Nevertheless, although Applicants believe that the claim 1 pursuant to the amendment of August 28, 2008 contains recitals that are not disclosed by the Cromer et al. patent, for the sake of advancing prosecution, during the teleconference, Applicants agreed to a further clarification of claim 1. In particular, Applicants are clarifying claim 1 to recite:

> situating a configuration device at an installation location in a system, wherein the configuration device is connected to a coupler for an intelligent unit, and is not a component of said intelligent unit ...

Thus, Applicants are clarifying that the configuration device is not a component of the intelligent unit.

In the Cromer et al. patent, as noted above, the RFID tag is installed within the computer (see FIG. 1, Block 21; and col. 3, lines 14 – 16). The Cromer et al. patent neither discloses nor suggests a configuration device that is **not a component of said intelligent unit**, as recited in claim 1. Thus, the Cromer et al. patent does not anticipate claim 1.

Claims 2 – 16 and 19 – 31 depend from claim 1. By virtue of this dependence, claims 2 – 16 and 19 – 31 are also novel over the Cromer et al. patent.

Applicants are requesting reconsideration and withdrawal of the section 102(b) rejection of claims 1 – 16 and 19 – 31.

As mentioned above, and as agreed during the teleconference, Applicants are clarifying an aspect of claim 1 that is not disclosed by the Cromer et al. patent. Additionally, Applicants are amending claim 7 to correct a grammatical error.

In view of the foregoing, Applicants respectfully submit that all claims presented in this application patentably distinguish over the prior art. Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request favorable consideration and that this application be passed to allowance.

Since this amendment neither raises new issues nor requires further consideration, entry is respectfully solicited. If the Examiner deems that the present amendment does not place the application in condition for allowance, Applicants respectfully request that it be entered for the purpose of appeal.

Respectfully submitted,

December 10, 2008
Date

Charles N.J. Ruggiero
Reg. No. 28,468
Attorney for the Applicants
Ohlandt, Greeley, Ruggiero & Perle, L.L.P.
One Landmark Square, 10th Floor
Stamford, CT 06901-2682
Tel: 203-327-4500
Fax: 203-327-6401